DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 209 FL 001 394

AUTHOR TERRAS, V.
TITLE ASPECT AND TENSE IN RUSSIAN.
INSTITUTION AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES.
PUB DATE 60
NOTE 14P.
JOURNAL CIT SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL; NEW SERIES V4 (18) P331-344 1960

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC NOT AVAILABLE FROM EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS DIACHRONIC LINGUISTICS, *FORM CLASSES (LANGUAGES), GRAMMAR, LINGUISTIC PATTERNS, LINGUISTICS, *MORPHOLOGY (LANGUAGES), *RUSSIAN, SLAVIC LANGUAGES, *STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS, SYNCHRONIC LINGUISTICS, *VERBS

ABSTRACT

ACCEPTING THE PERFECTIVE ASPECT AS THE "MARKED" CORRELATIVE OF A TRUE MORPHOLOGICAL CORRELATION IN THE OPPOSITION OF PERFECTIVE:IMPERFECTIVE IN RUSSIAN VERB STUDY, THE AUTHOR DISREGARDS NON-SYSTEMIC FACTS IN ORDER TO CONCENTRATE ON THE ASPECT RELATIONS AS THEY APPEAR IN "LINEAR PAIRS". THE AUTHOR PROCEEDS TO DESCRIBE THE FUNCTIONS OF THE ASPECT CATEGORY AS THEY APPEAR IN THE DIFFERENT FORMS OF THE FINITE AND INFINITE VERBS. FORMS WHICH DO NOT ALLOW FOR POSSIBLE CONFUSION IN ASPECT AND TENSE DISCRIMINATION LEAD THE WRITER TO FIRST EXAMINE THE INFINITIVE AND THE IMPERATIVE. THE PRESENT-FUTURE, PRETERITE, AND PARTICIPLE AND GERUNDS ARE THEN EXAMINED WITH EXAMPLES OF GRAMMATICAL APPLICATION. (RL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED036209

FL 001 394

ASPECT AND TENSE IN RUSSIAN

By V. Terras

University of Illinois

There have been many attempts to define the Russian verbal aspects, or at least to describe them in a way that would be both concise and complete.[1] Although the realization of the inherent asymmetry of this morphological correlation[2] has made this task somewhat easier, the picture is still far from clear. Recently the trend has been toward acceptance of the perfective aspect as the "marked" correlative of a true morphological correlation.[3] In the past, numerous efforts have been made to subdivide each aspect, especially the perfective, into subcategories, so that the correlation perfective : imperfective would appear to be a logical abstraction more than an expression of grammatical fact. In the following, it will be taken for granted that the aspect is a general category of the Russian verb, i.e., every verbal form in a live context is, at least in principle, either perfective or imperfective.

The majority of all Russian verbs are members of a "linear pair," i.e. a pair of verbs which differ in their aspect only, and which, in effect, are considered to be one verb by many grammarians. Given such a pair, the perfective, as a rule, can be distinguished from the imperfective verb by formal criteria. The morphological details are, however, quite complicated. Thus, a verbal prefix perfectivates an imperfective verb, but not the indeterminate forms of "double imperfectives." According to Regnell[4] and other authors, these verbs have to be understood as "second imperfectives" of the respective perfective forms, i.e., there is a correlation prinesu : prinošu, but none of the type nošu : prinošu. Or, the suffix -nu / -ne is, in modern Russian as well as in the past, a genuine perfective suffix, but a number of imperfective verbs also have it. These verbs are apparently back formations from prefixed forms, e.g., gasnut' from pogasnut'.[5]

Modern Russian has only one productive imperfective suffix, -yva (-iva). The older suffixes -va, -ja, and -a are unproductive. As a result, many derived imperfectives are not immediately recognizable as such, e.g., uznavat', uverjat', pokupat' can be classed as imperfectives only if we know their perfective equivalents.

In some cases the aspect correlation is expressed by lexical means, e.g., lovit' : pojmat'.

A number of verbs are used as both perfectives and imperfectives, a fact speaking in favor of the conception according to which the perfective and imperfective forms of a linear pair are really one verb. The productive group of verbs in -ovat' belongs here. However, there seems to be a tendency to perfectivate these verbs by means of a "préverbe vide," e.g., organizovat' : sorganizovat'.

A considerable number of verbs are perfectiva and imperfectiva tantum, e.g., očnut'sja, očutit'sja, rexnut'sja appear as perfectives only, preobladat', bezdejstvovat', opasat'sja have imperfective forms only.

In modern literary Russian, the iterative verbs have been, aside of a few non-systemic exceptions, integrated into the dual aspect system.[6] Old Russian texts as well as modern Russian dialects show authentic iterative forms derived from perfective, and from imperfective verbs. Clearly, such verbs as pivat', bivat', pekat' do not fit into what we understand to be the Russian aspect system, but represent a special grammatical subcategory.

In the following we shall disregard the above-mentioned and other facts which can be considered non-systemic, and concentrate on the aspect relations as they appear in linear pairs.

We shall now describe the functions of the aspect category as they appear in the different forms of the finite and infinite verb. Meillet[7] pointed out that the forms in which no confusion of the tense and aspect categories was possible should serve as the principal testing ground for inquiries into the nature of the verbal aspects. Such forms are the infinitive, the imperative, and the supine, the last being no longer present in Russian. We shall begin our description with these forms.

The Infinitive.

If we compare the perfective and imperfective forms of different pairs of verbs, we see that the functional distinction is not the same in every case, but that, on the other hand, there is always some distinction between them: In modern Russian, no perfective verb can be connected with the verbs načat', stat', prodolžat', končit', brosit' and other verbs which semantically imply duration.[8] It is interesting to note that Vaillant[9] considers this syntactical trait to be the most reliable criterion of the imperfective, as against the perfective aspect, in Old Church Slavic. Thus, all perfective infinitives form a set, as against all imperfective infinitives. In this respect, the various subdivisions of the perfective aspect function alike: the semelfactive stuknut', the determinative posidet', and the inceptive zakričat' all have the common property of absolute incompatibility with a verb implying duration.

On the other hand, the different subdivisions of the perfective aspect are quite real. In each of them, the indeterminate action suggested by the lexical meaning of the imperfective verb is determined in a specific fashion. In fact, the terms determinate and indeterminate fit the true nature of the aspect category—as it appears here, that is, in the infinitive—much better than the terms perfective and imperfective.[10] One may speak of the following types of correlation:

(1) The distinction between the perfective and the imperfective form is largely lexical, i.e., it does not follow a common functional pattern, e.g., ljubit' : poljubit' (the meaning "to grow fond of" is not the one we might expect).

(2) The distinction is lexico-grammatical, i.e., whereas the lexical meaning of the two verbs is different, such distinction follows a set pattern, e.g., govorit' : zagovorit' (inceptive); kušat' : pokušat' (determinative); vzdyxat' : vzdoxnut' (semelfactive).

(3) The distinction is strictly grammatical, i.e., it amounts to the difference in aspect. This is the case in what we call "linear pairs," e.g. načat' : načinat' ; doigrat' : doigryvat', etc.

As to the linear pairs, the question must be raised whether the relation of perfective to imperfective infinitive is always the same, quite regardless of whether the correlation belongs to the types primary imperfective : prefixed

perfective, primary perfective : 2nd imperfective with unproductive suffix, or prefixed perfective : 2nd imperfective with productive (or unproductive) suffix. I think that the pairs primary imperfective : perfective "au préverbe vide"[11] should not be considered on a par with the pairs perfective : 2nd imperfective, as is done by many authors. The fact is that, in a majority of all cases, the "préverbe vide" has a trace of lexical meaning left. Vaillant's statement, "... et il subsiste toujours le sentiment confus que le préverbe veut dire quelque chose, même quand on ne peut préciser quoi,"[12] is true of modern Russian just as much as of OCS. It must be also noted that, whereas a variety of prefixes have functioned, or still function as "préverbes vides" in OCS, OR, and modern Russian, none of them has ever gained anything close to a monopoly of that field—which could have been expected if these were truly grammatical morphemes, without a trace of lexical meaning. There is a trend in modern Russian, particularly evident in loanwords and neologisms, to use the prefixes po-, za-, o-, s-, and some others, as a strictly grammatical mark of the perfective aspect. But I think that such procedure is not as generally valid as that by which an imperfective can be formed from a given perfective, e.g., zatormaživat' from zatormozit'. Also, whereas we have a variety of prefixes acting as "préverbe vide," modern Russian has only one productive suffix of imperfectivation.

The above implies that, whereas perfectivation by means of a prefix is always, to a certain extent, a lexical phenomenon, and the perfective suffix -nu / -ne has a specific, momentative or semelfactive meaning, imperfectivation results in an almost purely "grammatical" correlation. I said "almost" because, in some cases, 2nd imperfectives (especially those in -yva / -iva) may display an apparent associative connection with the iteratives, provided the speaker is aware of the latter category.

Furthermore, as Karcewski first pointed out, perfectivation brings along secondary grammatical effects, such as t change from intransitive to transitive.[13] Second imperfectives, on the other hand, retain the lexical and syntactic features of the perfective.

To recapitulate: The distinction between a perfective and an imperfective infinitive indicates a distinction between determinate and indeterminate action. The perfective form

is, if we disregard those infinitives which have an iterative meaning, the marked one, regardless of whether it is "primary" or "secondary." The nature and degree of determinateness, however, varies greatly. In some types of correlation, it can be clearly defined, either lexically (ljubit' : poljubit'), or grammatically (govorit' : zagovorit'). Our difficulties start only with the linear pairs where the determinateness of the perfective form is quite abstract. The difference between prošu načat' and prošu načinat', or that between prošu doigrat' nezakončennye partii and prošu doigryvat' nezakončennye partii is hard to define. The reason for this difficulty is, it would seem, the following: An existing formal correlation which is not tied to a definite syntactic, or to a specific conceptual function, cannot fail to become an instrument in the hands of the stylist. It is precisely in those cases where a formal correlation has no definite content that a variety of subtle nuances can be suggested, rather than expressed, by the speaker. The distinction between perfective and imperfective forms in the infinitive of linear pairs is such a correlation. The difficulties of grammarians in defining the function of the aspect correlation in linear pairs is simply the difficulty one is bound to face when trying to express stylistic observations in rational terms.

One of the stylistic functions of this correlation is that of emphasis. For instance, the emphatic use of the imperfective aspect in the imperative, but especially in the prohibitive infinitive is analogous to a similar usage in the imperative, e.g., ètomu ne byvat' (more emphatic than the perfective form). Also in negative clauses, e.g., "Da čto, Mar'ja Vasil'evna, osmeljus' doložit'-s, predprinimat' tut nečego-s, kak tol'ko vnesti vseju polnost'ju summu-s." (A.N. Plesčeev, Žitejskie sceny.)

In the imperative, the use of the imperfective aspect after a negation has been "grammaticalized." It is also apparently developing in the same direction in the infinitive. Thus, the answer to the optional pustit' ego? / puskat' ego? is normally ne puskat'! rather than ne pustit'! However, the speaker still has a choice, the imperfective form being the more emphatic.

A description of the stylistic use of the aspects is beyond the scope of this paper. I shall give only one example to indicate the nature of it: Esenin's famous last words, "V ètoj

žizni umirat' ne novo, / No i žit', konečno, ne novej," were thus paraphrased by Majakovskij: "V ètoj žizni pomeret' ne trudno. / Sdelat' žizn' značitel'no trudnej." What makes it even more interesting is that Majakovskij in his article "Kak delat' stixi?" quotes himself thus: "V ètoj žizni pomirat' ne trudno, / Sdelat' žizn' značitel'no trudnej." Naturally, the perfective pomeret', as against the imperfective umirat', has a definite stylistic function. The perfective form takes something away from the pathos of the original, which the replacement of the prefix u- by po- also does. It makes "dying" appear less important.

We could then distinguish the following types of use for the correlation perfective : imperfective in infinitives of linear pairs: (1) The aspect is determined by the syntactical constellation, e.g., after verbs which rule an imperfective infinitive; (2) the aspect is determined by stylistic considerations, as in the example just quoted; (3) the aspect is funcitonless, e.g., in a phrase like nu čto, načinat'? / nu čto, načat'?

The Imperative.

Here, as in the infinitve, a syntactical criterion exists by which the aspects can be distinguished: The negative (prohibitive) imperative is predominantly imperfective. Whenever the negative imperative of a perfective verb is used, it has the specific meaning of a warning. Šaxmatov considered this feature to be one of the (altogether six) functional criteria by which the perfective can be distinguished from the imperfective aspect. For instance, "go!" could be ujdite! or uxodite! But "dont't go" is always ne uxodite! And ne upadi! means "watch your step!" Another example: ne ubej ego means "careful, you may kill him!"

It is interesting to note that such usage has exact parallels in other IE languages. Thus, in classical Armenian, the imperative of the present is always prohibitive, whereas the imperative of the aorist is not. The relation of presential to aoristic aspect (or better, "Aktionsart") is roughly that of indeterminate to determinate forms in other IE languages, such as classical Greek. In classical, as well as in Homeric Greek, only the present imperative (with μή) is used in negative and prohibitive phrases. It appears that the rather rare exceptions in which the aorist imperative does appear after μή are of the same type as the

respective usage in Russian. This striking parallel was recognized early.[14] Greek grammarians generally explain this peculiarity as we should like to explain the Slavic equivalent: A prohibition seldom refers to a determinate event, but covers a number of possibilities. If a determinate event is thought of (as in a warning), the determinate form may be used.

We see then that a feature which is typical of the correlation determinate : indeterminate in Greek and Armenian appears as a feature of the correlation perfective : imperfective in the Slavic languages. It seems that, in Russian, the determinate forms of double imperfectives are also but rarely used with the negative, although such usage is not ungrammatical.

Only perfective verbs have, according to Šaxmatov and others, an imperative of the 1st person plural, e.g., pojdëmte. vypjemte etc. Again, it can be noted that the determinate forms of double imperfectives do permit this form, e.g., idëmte.

Interestingly, such syntax of the imperative may be a feature which has only relatively recently developed. According to Vaillant, the negative imperative is more often perfective than not in OCS.[15] The question is whether Vaillant's observation is entirely correct. Since no colloquial texts are available, the number of imperatives in the OCS texts is rather small, and many of them (e.g., the negative ones of the ten commandments) may be understood as belonging to the special case of "warning."

Otherwise the distinction between perfective and imperfective imperative is the same as observed in the infinitive: The imperfective is the unmarked indeterminate form, and the perfective is the marked determinate form. In many instances the nature of determinateness is vague, approaching the limit of "grammaticalization." Thus, pojmi že! and ponimaj že! or daj! and davaj! are hard to distinguish semantically. However, the distinction becomes clearer when the imperative is placed into a specific syntactic context. For instance, pojmi že menja rather than ponimaj že menja.

It appears that aspect correlation can also be used stylistically in the imperative. It would seem that, in the case of linear pairs, the imperfective imperative is the

more emphatic, e.g., ubirajsja otsjuda! as against uberis' otsjuda! or davaj časy! as against daj časy! or snimaj pal'to! as against snimi pal'to!

The Present-Future.

The function of aspect correlation is more complex here then it is in the infinitive or in the imperative.

In modern Russian, the present of an imperfective verb has the function of a present tense, and is correlated to the periphrastic future formed by means of the auxiliary budu, budeš', etc. Its frequent use as a praesens historicum, its occasional future function, as well as its use in statements of general validity are plainly secondary functions which are non-systemically derived from the basic function of an indeterminate present.

The present of a perfective verb has, especially in the main clause, normally a future meaning. Contrary to Vinogradov,[16] and other authors, I should say that the pairs of the type sprošu : sprašivaju do form a correlation, the present being the marked form.

There is no doubt that, historically, the use of the perfective present in lieu of a future is but a special case of perfective (determinate) action.[17] Older scholars seem to have taken it for granted that it directly replaced the older -s- future.[18] However, synchronically, the relation between ja vas sprošu and ja vas sprašivaju, or between ja doigraju partiju and ja doigryvaju partiju is, in most cases of actual usage, quite different from that between sprosit' and sprašivat' or between doigrat' and doigryvat'. The contradiction between the fact that the perfective form is marked in the infinitive and in the imperative, but may appear as the unmarked form in the present : future, is explained by the fact that the relation is not the same at all in both cases. A priori, there ought to be no reason why a present could not be a marked form.[19]

There remains the question how to integrate the cases where the perfective present does not have a future meaning into the Russian verbal system. These cases are:

(1) In subordinate clauses, the present of a perfective verb can function as a present, as well as a preterit, in addition to its future function, e.g., ona bednaja vdova, živet tol'ko tem, čto s doma polučit (Gončarov, Oblomov), Načal tatar pokolačitvat' / Maxnët rukoj—ulica / Otmaxnët nazad—pereuloček (Bylina).

(2) As a praesens historicum, e.g., Protopopica bednaja bredët, bredët, da i povalitsja... (Avvakum, Žitie).

(3) As a resultative, e.g., "... i moljus', i moljus' do toj pory, poka vladyčica ne posmotrit na menja s ikony ljubovnee." (Dostoevskij, Xozjajka).

(4) In negative clauses of the type "Tišina, ne ševel'nëtsja ni odin list." (Čexov, Skučnaja istorija).

In the above cases, it appears that we are dealing with a genuine determinate present. In the following cases, where no future meaning is in evidence, either, we may, apparently, see a metaphoric use of the future:

(1) General statements, such as proverbs, e.g., prošlogo ne vorotiš'. It can be noted that languages which have a genuine future tense often use it in such cases, for instance, Lith. Kàs vóks ne-pralóps "He who steals won't get rich."

(2) Certain standard phrases such as ja už poprošu vas.

(3) Categoric statements, e.g. "A v našem gorode sejčas iz vsego sdelajut prestuplenie." (F. Sologub, Melkij bes).

(4) Various shades of indefiniteness, hesitation, and polite restraint are expressed by the use of the perfective present, e.g., "A kto ž takaja budete?" sprosila Tat'jana. (Turgenev, Nov').

Apparently, we have, in the present / future system, a case of incomplete "grammaticalization."[20] The perfective present functions, depending upon the context, as either a determinate present, or as a future. In the former case, its relation to the imperfective present is equivalent to the relation between perfective and an imperfective infinitive. In the latter, it is of an entirely different order. The distinction between a determinate and an indeterminate present is used stylistically in the above quoted cases where the perfective present does not have a future meaning. It is used grammatically when it does.

The Preterit.

In the preterit, too, we fail to find the relations which we should expect to exist on the basis of the facts observed in connection with infinitive and imperative.

The imperfective preterit has the following basic function:

(1) It is an unmarked preterital form, e.g., "Čaju? A

čto ž, razve vypit' ešče stakančik?"—"Net, ne xoču."—Razve už pil gde-nibud'?"—"Da ešče kakoj čaj-to pil!" (Pleščeev, Žitejskie sceny.)

(2) It acts as a perfectum praesens, i.e., it expresses an event of the past, the effect of which extends into the present, e.g., "Ty literaturen, ty čital, ty umeeš' vosxiščat'sja." (Dostoevskij, Podrostok).

(3) It acts as a marked durative, or iterative imperfect, e.g., "Kak teper' pomnju utro, v kotoroe my perebiralis' s Peterburgskoj storony na Vasil'evskij ostrov." (Dostoevskij Bednye ljudi.) Or "Nikogda, naprimer, on ne pozvoljal sebe s'est' vsego obeda, predlagaemogo každodnevno Ustin'ej Fëdorovnoj ego tovariščam. Obed stoil poltinu; Semën Ivanovič upotrebljal tol'ko dvadcat' pjat' kopeek med'ju i nikogda ne vosxodil vyše..." (Dostoevskij, Gospodin Proxarčin).

The perfective preterit, on the other hand, has these functions:

(1) It is a marked preterital form, denoting an event which either began, or ended in the past, e.g., on vypil dva stakana, or on zapil.

(2) It acts as a perfectum praesens, e.g., propali naši golovuški.

(3) It is an unmarked preterital form, e.g. Gorodničij potrepal ego po pleču, poželal ot duši uspexa i otpravilsja domoj. (V.A. Sollogub, Sabačka.)

Such a condition can be understood only as essentially a reflection of the Old Russian (and OCS) tense system.[21] The imperfective preterit reflects the functions of the OR imperfect, perfective as well as imperfective. Thus, iterative perfective (determinate) action, for which the imperfect of a perfective verb would have appeared in OR, is expressed by the imperfective preterit in modern Russian. The OR imperfect was "marked" with regard to the aorist, and so the imperfective preterit seems to appear as a "marked" form in modern Russian, whenever it has that function.

Similarly, the perfective preterit is not necessarily a marked form, but may act as an unmarked narrative preterit, equivalent to the—also unmarked—OR aorist.

It is also to be noted that the Russian preterit, perfective as well as imperfective, has retained its original function of a perfectum praesens, a form which in OR was neutral as far as aspect is concerned.

The above-described functional distribution in modern Russian indicates that, at the point when the OR perfect (a "marked" form!) began to be used as an unmarked preterit as well, aspect and tense relations were still being kept apart, as far as aorist and perfective aspect were concerned. The aoristic use of the imperfective preterit in modern Russian indicates that imperfective aorists must have been in use at the time. On the other hand, the imperfect and the imperfective aspect seem to have become tied together before the perfect replaced the old imperfect. Such an assumption is corroborated by historical evidence.[22]

Our assumption that there exists a continuity between the functional system of the modern Russian preterit and the OR tense system is made plausible by the fact that the OR texts of even the oldest specimens of Muscovite literature show essentially the same situation as modern Russian. Interestingly, there is no record of a transitional stage from the old to the new system, i.e., texts in which aorist and imperfect, on one hand, and the -l perfect, on the other, would be used indiscriminately. As to the texts in which there is a semblance of such indiscriminate usage, it appears that it is due to errors on the part of the author, or of a scribe, rather than to its reflecting the actual condition of live speech.

Participles and Gerunds.

It is generally understood that all four participles are, in modern as well as in OR, loans from OCS. There is no record of a state of the Russian language in which the participles were used as in OCS, or as in literary Russian. Genuinely Russian participial forms are preserved in verbal adjectives such as gorjačij, ljubimyj, usopšij, prokljatyj, as well as in the gerunds.[23]

Numerous examples given by Obnorskij show that the past gerund in -v, -vši, -mši, etc., can be formed from both perfective and imperfective verbs, although the former are much more frequent. Still there can be no doubt as to the regularity of such forms of guljavši, bravši, evši. The verbal adjectives corresponding to the old past passive participle can be formed from both perfective and imperfective verbs. The same is true of the past participles, active as well as passive, of literary Russian: Although perfective forms are much more frequent, imperfective forms cannot be considered to be irregular.

The gerund in -*uči* is, even in the dialects, an isolated form. It appears that, all through the Muscovite period, it is a form used in specific expressions only, e.g., *žit' pripevajuči*. It is normally formed from imperfective verbs, but "mistakes" are frequent.

The gerund in -*ja* is a problem in itself. In older Muscovite texts (e.g., Avvakum's *Žitie*, *Povest' ob Azovskom osadnom sidenii*, Ivan the Terrible's letters to Kurbskij), it is formed with regularity from both perfective and imperfective verbs. Also, modern Russian writers have numerous perfective forms, although the imperfective ones prevail. According to Obnorskij,[24] such a condition is a result of the conflict between tense and aspect. If I understand Obnorskij rightly, this means that, since the "aspect label" is pronounced enough to distinguish the gerunds of, say, *stavit'* and *postavit'*, the tense label can be dropped as redundant, so that, instead of *stavja* and *postaviv*, we get *stavja* and *postavja*. The matter is, however, complicated by the fact that, in all of the texts in which the -*ja* gerund is used in this fashion, the gerund in -*v* (*ši*) is also used, and that it is also formed from both perfective and imperfective verbs.[25] Perhaps it is correct to say that the -*ja* gerund is neutral as far as tense is concerned, whereas the -*v* (*ši*) gerund is a past form.

The tendency of modern literary Russian to form a present participle from imperfective verbs only, continues a like tendency of OCS. However, whereas in OCS and in OR perfective forms seem to have been not irregular, being quite frequent in the usage of some texts, the *Codex Suprasliensis* for instance, they are now felt to be "ungrammatical." The present passive participle is, already in OCS, on its way to becoming a verbal adjective designating aptitude. Both perfective and imperfective forms appear, the perfective being rather more common in the negative. Modern Russian shows practically the same picture.

It is difficult to establish any particular trend in the relation of the tense and aspect categories in the participles and gerunds. The fact that the perfective present participles have not developed into future participles indicates that the development of the present participle and gerund has been independent from that of the finite forms. On the other hand, there is the decided trend in modern Russian to identify the present participle (and, in part, the present gerund) with the imperfective aspect. In the past participles and gerund,

a similar trend to identify these with the perfective aspect exists, but in a much weaker form.

Synopsis.

I agree completely with Kurylowicz[26] that an authentic aspect correlation appears, in the modern Slavic languages, and in Russian in particular, only on the periphery of the verbal system. I should say that only in the infinitive and in the imperative, as well as to a certain extent in the participles, the aspect correlation has retained its proto-Slavic character. Here it is still basically what Indo-European scholars call a determinate : indeterminate correlation. It must be noted that, although the Slavic perfective : imperfective correlation is functionally close to the determinate : indeterminate correlation in other IE languages, there is no historical connection between them.

In the finite system of the Slavic verb, and the Russian verb in particular, the existing formal correlation of functionally determinate : indeterminate verbal forms has been harnessed to serve in a quite different capacity. In the present/future system, it was "grammaticalized" early, perhaps at the proto-Slavic stage. In the preterit system, each Slavic language has gone its own way. In Russian, the old distinction between aorist and imperfect has been identified with the aspect correlation. The whole development is a fine example of morphological syncretism.

Notes

1. See, for instance, V. V. Vinogradov, Russkij jazyk (Moskva, 1947), or, for more recent literature, Rudolf Ruzicka, Der Verbalaspekt in der altrussischen Nestorchronik (Berlin, 1957).

2. See Roman Jakobson, Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums, (Prague: Charisteria Mathesio, 1932), pp. 74-84.

3. See, e.g., James Ferrell, "The Meaning of the Perfective Aspect in Russian," Word, VII (1951), 104-135.

4. C. G. Regnell, Über den Ursprung des slavischen Verbalaspekts (Lund, 1944), p. 61.

5. See Regnell, pp. 78-80.

6. Such pairs as žit' - živat', znat' - znavat', vidat' - vidyvat' are dying out, and are certainly unproductive. The only form of these verbs still in use is the preterit, which, accordingly, ought to be considered a form of the primary verb, i.e., sžival is a form of sidet', not of *sživat'. See Vinogradov, p. 502.

7. A. Meillet, Le Slave commun (Paris, 1924), p. 243.

8. For details see, e.g., S. Karcevski, Remarques sur la psychologie des aspects en russe, (Geneva: Mélanges Bally, 1939), p. 236.

9. André Vaillant, Manuel du Vieux slave (Paris, 1948), p. 329.

10. Vinogradov is of this opinion. He mentions that M. N. Katkov used these terms long ago.

11. A. Meillet's term.

12. Op. cit., p. 320.

13. Op. cit., p. 234.

14. I found references to earlier works on this subject in Raphael Kühner, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, (2nd ed., Hannover, 1870), II, 203.

15. Op. cit., p. 329.

16. Op. cit., p. 574.

17. It must be noted, however, that J. Kurylowicz, "Réflexions sur l'imparfait et les aspects en vieux slave," International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, I-II (1959), pp. 5-6, expresses himself as against this view.

18. E.g., W. Vondrák, Vergleichende slavische Grammatik, (Göttingen, 1908) II, 187.

19. Modern Persian, for instance, has a marked (usually durative) present, formed by the prefix mi-.

20. To clarify what I mean by this, I shall give another example: In colloquial German, the "Hilfsverb des Modus" wollen forms a future. However, not in all cases does it have such function. For instance, ich will hingehen may mean "I'll go there," or "I want to go there," depending upon whether the accent is on hingehen, or on will. In English, the grammaticalization of this form is complete.

21. For a description of same see C. H. Van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System ('S-Gravenhage, 1959).

22. P. S. Kuznecov, Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva, 1953), p. 230, mentions the fact that in several copies of the Russian Povest' vremennyx let many original perfective imperfects were replaced by their imperfective equivalents by later scribes.

23. S. P. Obnorskij, Očerki po morfologii russkogo glagola (Moskva, 1953), p. 217.

24. Op. cit., p. 222.

25. Avvakum, for instance, has pokinja, ograbja, vytašča, dostroja, alongside vidja, leža, sidja, uča, but also videv, plyvše, plakavsja alongside sobravše, vozstavše, vzjav, sedše.

26. Op. cit., p. 6.